

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF GEORGIA
COLUMBUS DIVISION**

SEAN HILL CRAWLEY,	:	
	:	
Plaintiff,	:	
	:	CASE NO. 4:12-CV-0222-CDL-MSH
VS.	:	42 U.S.C. § 1983
	:	
Warden ANTHONY WASHINGTON	:	
	:	
Defendant.	:	

ORDER TO SUPPLEMENT

Plaintiff Sean Jill Crawley, a prisoner currently confined in Phillips State Prison, filed the present *pro se* civil rights action under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 and is proceeding *in forma pauperis*. After an initial review of his Complaint, the United State Magistrate Judge in the Valdosta Division directed Plaintiff to recast. (Order, Aug. 22, 2012, ECF No. 5.) Plaintiff complied, and his Recast Complaint (ECF No. 6) was then transferred to the District Court in the Columbus Division. (Order, Sept. 5, 2012, ECF No. 7.)¹

This action apparently arises out of Defendant Warden Washington's failure to respond to Plaintiff's appeal of findings made at his disciplinary hearings. The Complaint describes two different times in which Plaintiff received a disciplinary report ("D.R."), was provided a hearing on the matter, and sought to appeal the subsequent guilty finding. Plaintiff alleges that he properly filed his appeals with Warden Washington and that the Warden nonetheless failed to provide any response, which allegedly prevented Plaintiff

¹ Warden Washington is the only named Defendant in Plaintiff's Recast Complaint. The Clerk is directed to amend the docket accordingly.

from being able to further appeal the disciplinary sanctions.

Based on these allegations, the undersigned will presume that Plaintiff intended to bring a due process claim. Plaintiff's Complaint, however, fails to provide enough detail about the disciplinary sanctions imposed so as to allow the Court to determine whether he has stated a plausible claim against Defendant Washington. *See Sandin v. Conner*, 515 U.S. 472, 484 (1995); *Bass v. Perrin*, 170 F.3d 1312, 1318 (11th Cir. 1999). Plaintiff is thus **ORDERED** to supplement his Recast Complaint with allegations describing: (1) the type and duration of the disciplinary sanctions imposed; and (2) what injury he has suffered as a result of the alleged denial of due process.

This supplement should not exceed five (5) handwritten pages, and Plaintiff will have only **TWENTY-ONE (21) DAYS** from the date of this Order to submit his supplement. Failure to comply with this Order may result in the dismissal of Plaintiff's Complaint. There shall be no service of process until further order of the Court.

SO ORDERED, this 17th day of September 2012.

S/ Stephen Hyles
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE